



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 06-04

Paper No: 12

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF
TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD/
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

In re Application of
England :
Application No. 09/991,828 :
Filing Date: 21 November, 2001 :
Attorney Docket No. 42390P6233C :

COPY MAILED

JUN 1 8 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

This is a decision on the petition filed on 22 March, 2004, to revive the instant application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), as abandoned due to unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- it appeared that Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on 24 November, 2003, with reply due absent extension of time on 24 December, 2003;
- a result, the application was deemed abandoned after midnight 24 December, 2003;
- Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 3 February, 2004;
- the instant matter was considered as a request to withdraw the holding of abandonment

under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 (because Petitioner included with the instant petition, *inter alia*: documents evidencing the filing of a reply with a request and fee for a three- (3-) month extension of time via FAX on 22 March, 2004), and the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 was granted;

- thus, the instant petition is moot.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).¹

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

² Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁵ See: *Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment*, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office *supra*.

regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶))

CONCLUSION

The holding of abandonment previously was withdrawn, and, therefore, the instant petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **dismissed as moot**, and the petition fee is refunded via Deposit Account 50-0221.

The file is being forwarded to Technology Center 2600 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁶ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.